

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-2, 4-12, 14-22, 24, 26-31, and 33-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,128,642 to Doraswamy et al. (hereinafter “Doraswamy”) in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,813,767 to Willke (hereinafter “Willke”). Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doraswamy in view of Willke in further view of U.S. Patent Number 6,711,616 issued to Stamm et al. (hereinafter “Stamm”). Claim 25 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doraswamy in view of Willke in further view of U.S. Patent Number 6,192,388 issued to Cajolet (hereinafter “Cajolet”). Claims 23 and 32 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim. The amendment to the specification filed June 9, 2005 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132(a) for introducing new matter.

Claims 1-2, 4-14, 16, 23, 27, 29, and 32-34 are canceled with this response. Claim 15 is amended with the allowable limitations of claim 23 and claim 26 is amended with the allowable limitations of claim 32. The objected to amendments to the specification are canceled. The title of the invention is amended to clearly indicate the invention to which the claims are directed.

### **Response to objection to amendment filed June 9, 2005 under 35 U.S.C. § 132(a)**

The Examiner objected to amendments to specification pages 11-13 and Figure 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 132(a). The objected to amendments have been canceled and replaced with the original text and drawing. The Examiner further objected to the title as amended. The title has been amended to the title suggested in the office action of July 7, 2005.

### **Response to rejections of claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and under 35 U.S.C. § 112 second paragraph**

Claims 1-2, 4-12, 14-22, 24, 26-31, and 33-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doraswamy in view of Willke. Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doraswamy in view of Willke in further view of Stamm. Claim 25 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Doraswamy in view of Willke in further view of Cajolet

Claims 1-2, 4-14, 16, 23, 27, 29, and 32-34 are canceled. With regards to independent claims 15 and 26, claim 15 is amended with the allowable limitations of claim 23 and claim 26 is amended with the allowable limitations of claim 32, thus placing claims 23 and 32 in an allowable independent form. Applicants assert that with the amended limitations, claims 15 and 23 are allowable. Applicants have not specifically traversed the rejections of dependent claims 17, 19-21, 24-25, 28, 30-31, and 35-36 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), but believe those claims to be allowable for depending from allowable claims. See, *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Should additional information be required regarding the amendment of the claims enumerated above, the Examiner is respectfully asked to notify Applicant of such need. If any impediments to the prompt allowance of the claims can be resolved by a telephone conversation, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,



Brian C. Kunzler  
Reg. No. 38,527  
Attorney for Applicant

Date: September 7, 2005  
Kunzler & Associates  
8 East Broadway, Suite 600  
Salt Lake City, UT 84111  
Telephone (801) 994-4646  
Fax (801) 531-1929